MASS.

HS70.2:W842

UMASS/AMHERST

312066 0282 4143 9

WOMEN RELEASED DIRECTLY FROM MCI-FRAMINGHAM
1979 RELEASES

Prepared by:

Lawrence T. Williams
Research Specialist

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS
COLLECTION

JUN 3 1981

University of Massachusetts
Depository Copy

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Louis M. Berman
Commissioner

October, 1980

PUBLICATION #12172
Approved by: John Manton, Acting State Purchasing Agent

304/29

ABSTRACT

This report examines those women who were released directly from MCI-Framingham, the institution for women offenders in Massachusetts, during 1979. There were several important findings. They are as follows:

1) The majority of women released directly from Framingham in 1979 had not participated in graduated release programs (92%) or the furlough program (86%) during their current incarceration.

2) The majority of women (92%) released directly from Framingham in 1979 had not escaped during their current incarceration.

3) The majority of women (64%) released directly from Framingham in 1979 served more than one month prior to their release.

4) The women released directly from Framingham had characteristics that were associated with success in pre-release placement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	TITLE		PAGE NUMBER
I.	Introduction		1
II.	Sample		3
III.	Data Collection		3
IV.	Findings		3
V.	Table I -	Placement Histories - 1979 Framingham Releases	4
VI.	Table II -	Placement Histories and Furlough Participation 1979 Releases	5
VII.	Table III-	Escape History 1979 Framingham Releases	6
VIII.	Table IV -	Time Served 1979 Framingham Releases	7
IX.	Table V -	Time Served by Type of Release	8
X.	Table VI -	Scale Scores	10
XI.	Discussion		11
XII.	Footnotes		13
XIII.	Appendix		14
XIV.	References		29

INTRODUCTION

Department of Correction Research reports have consistently shown that individuals in the system who have had the opportunity to participate in community programs through placements in pre-release facilities or participation in the furlough program have statistically significantly lower rates of recidivism than those who do not have the opportunity of this experience.[1] Moreover, on a rather common sense basis it would seem to follow that since individuals in the criminal justice system will be returning to the community upon release, any attempts to better equip these individuals prior to their return would be a beneficial undertaking for a correctional system.

In spite of these results, there remains a significant number of individuals who are being released on parole or discharged directly from walled institutions into the community. The concern remains that these individuals may have been deprived of the opportunity to participate in graduated release or reintegration programs prior to their release. This concern is especially prevalent for women in the system. MCI-Framingham is a medium security institution that serves as the only walled institution for women offenders in Massachusetts. The recent trend in commitments of women to Framingham is for them to receive shorter sentences.[2] In fact, the most recent commitment report indicates that 69% of the women committed to Framingham in 1979 had maximum sentences of less than one year.[3] This would indicate that this population has more women eligible for participation in community programs and more in need of these placements since their incarceration periods are short in nature.

Contrary to expectations, there remains a large number of women who are being released directly from MCI-Framingham to the streets.

This study examines the population of women released from Framingham during 1979 in an attempt to gain a better understanding of their needs and placement histories.

SAMPLE:

The sample consists of all women released from MCI-Framingham during 1979. There were 160 women who were in the sample, 19 of whom were parole violators. Forty-six percent were released at expiration of sentence, 43% were paroled, and 11% were discharged.

DATA COLLECTION:

The analyses following in this report are based on four categories of variables: commitment variables, personal background variables, criminal history variables, and furlough variables. The material was collected from the Massachusetts Department of Correction Central Office files and from the computerized data base developed by the Correction and Parole Management Information System (CAPMIS) and was produced on the Massachusetts State College Computer Network (MSCCN).

FINDINGS:

While there were 160 women released from MCI-Framingham in 1979, not all women necessarily had to have spent their whole institutional life in Framingham. Some women could have had the opportunity to participate in pre-release facilities, failed at these facilities, been returned to Framingham and subsequently released from there. Ideally, walled institutions would be used to house women who are serious offenders or women who have repeatedly failed in lower security placements. However, the 1979 release population from Framingham does not follow this pattern. The placement histories of this population is presented in Table I.

TABLE I
PLACEMENT HISTORIES - 1979 FRAMINGHAM RELEASES*

	NUMBER	PERCENT
Prior Pre-Release Placements During Incarceration	13	(8)
No Prior Pre-Release Placements During Incarceration	147	(92)
TOTAL	160	(100)

As Table I shows, 92% of the women released from Framingham during 1979 had never received any pre-release placements during their incarceration. These women were released without benefit of participation in graduated release programs. Also, an examination of the present offenses of the women released in 1979 shows that the most frequently committed offense for the sample was larceny (18%) closely followed by prostitution (16%). These offenses are not usually thought of as serious offenses.

While a sizeable number of women are being released from Framingham without the benefit of alternate placements, it may be that they are receiving a significant number of furloughs that give them an opportunity to strengthen or else develop their community ties. Table II breaks the sample into groups according to participation in the furlough program and placement options.

* Those women who were parole violators are included in this table. The placement information covers their total incarceration for the current offense.

TABLE II

PLACEMENT HISTORIES AND FURLOUGH PARTICIPATION 1979 RELEASES

	NUMBER	PERCENT
Framingham Releases, No Pre-Release Placements, No Furloughs	129	(81)
Framingham Releases, No Pre-Release Placements, Furloughs	18	(11)
Framingham Releases, Pre-Release Placements, No Furloughs	8	(5)
Framingham Releases, Pre-Release Placements, Furloughs	5	(3)
TOTAL	160	(100)

As Table II shows, there are 137 women or 86% of the sample who never received a furlough during their incarceration. Also, 129 women or 81% of the sample never received placements or participated in the furlough program; i.e., spent all their institutional time in Framingham.

One reason that could be proposed to explain these results is that the women released in 1979 had evidenced patterns of repeated negative behavior in the institution. One way to examine this is by looking at escape statistics for the women in the sample since an escape represents a serious infraction of rules. Table III looks at whether any women in the sample had escaped during their incarceration.

TABLE III

ESCAPE HISTORY - 1979 FRAMINGHAM RELEASES

	NUMBER	PERCENT
Escapes During Incarceration	13	(8)
No Escapes During Incarceration	147	(92)
TOTAL	160	(100)

As Table III shows, there were only thirteen women who had escaped at least once during their incarceration who were released during 1979. The majority of the women released (92%) had never escaped from their institutions. Also, it is important to note that of the thirteen women who escaped, six were women who had received a pre-release placement and escaped from there. Only seven women or 4% of the sample had escaped from Framingham. This of course does not include those women who have escaped from Framingham and not been apprehended.

The last variable to be examined during this phase of analysis is the amount of time served by the women in the sample. If the majority of the sample is only serving one month or less, they probably could not be placed during their incarceration. Table V specifically looks at the amount of time served for women in the sample.

TABLE IV

TIME SERVED - 1979 FRAMINGHAM RELEASES*

	NUMBER	PERCENT
Same Day	5	(3)
1 - 2 Weeks	30	(19)
2 - 4 Weeks	22	(14)
1 - 3 Months	48	(30)
3 - 6 Months	16	(10)
6 - 9 Months	14	(9)
9 - 12 Months	9	(6)
1 - 2 Years	14	(9)
More Than 2 Years	2	(0)
TOTAL	160	(100)

As Table IV shows, 36% of the population served less than one month before being released. Sixty-four percent of the women released had served one month or longer prior to their release in 1979. Not only was the population eligible for pre-release placements, but they had served a long enough period of time for pre-release placements to be a viable option for them.

A further breakdown of time served was done according to type of release from Framingham. Group 1 contains only those women who were paroled; Group 2 contains women who received either a certificate of release or a certificate of discharge; and Group 3 contains those women who went to the expiration of their sentence. Table V summarizes these results.

* This table includes time served for parole violators in the sample. The time served for parole violators was computed by taking the time served from the date of return to the date of release.

TABLE V
TIME SERVED BY TYPE OF RELEASE

	PAROLES		DISCHARGE		EXPIRATION	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Same Day	0	(0)	0	(0)	5	(12)
1 - 2 Weeks	1	(2)	4	(8)	25	(58)
2 - 4 Weeks	7	(10)	9	(18)	6	(14)
1 - 3 Months	21	(31)	20	(42)	7	(16)
3 - 6 Months	9	(13)	7	(14)	0	(0)
6 - 9 Months	11	(16)	3	(6)	0	(0)
9 - 12 Months	6	(9)	3	(6)	0	(0)
1 - 2 Years	11	(16)	3	(6)	0	(0)
More Than 2 Years	2	(3)	0	(0)	0	(0)
TOTAL	68	(100)	49	(100)	43	(100)

As Table V shows, 84% of those women who served less than one month were released at expiration of sentence. Seventy-four percent of the discharges and 88% of the paroles served longer than one month before release.

Looking at the total releases from Framingham during 1979 and excluding those women who had escaped, those women who had prior pre-release failures this incarceration, and those who had served less than one month, there remains 84 women (53%) of the sample who had not had any escapes or pre-release failures this incarceration and who had served one month or longer prior to their release.

Another kind of analysis was done on this sample of women. This analysis involved a comparison of this sample of women with a sample of women released from Charlotte House, a pre-release facility for women in Massachusetts. Previous published reports done by the Research Unit on the Charlotte House releases identified eleven variables that distinguished successful completers from unsuccessful completers.[4] The eleven variables listed by unsuccessful and successful splits respectively are as follows:

	VARIABLE	UNSUCCESSFUL SPLIT	SUCCESSFUL SPLIT
1.	Time on Job of Longest Duration	Less Than 1 Year	1 Year or Longer
2.	Age at Release	25 Years or Younger	26 Years or Older
3.	Age at First Arrest	17 Years or Younger	18 Years or Older
4.	Number of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations	One or More	None
5.	Time at Most Skilled Position	Less Than 1 Year	1 Year or More
6.	Number of Charges for Property Offenses	Two or More	One or Fewer
7.	Number of Court Appearances	Four or More	Three or Fewer
8.	Age at Incarceration	21 Years or Younger	22 Years or Older
9.	Marital Status	Single	Other
10.	Number of Charges for Escape Offenses	One or More	None
11.	Number of Any Prior Incarcerations	One or More	None

A scale was constructed based on these eleven variables. One point was assigned for each item in the scale according to the dichotomies established above. That half of the dichotomy most linked with success received one point; the half linked with failure received no points. Eleven is the maximum score on the scale and would be associated with success at Charlotte House. Comparing the scores on this scale for the combined Charlotte House population for 1977 and 1978 and the Framingham releases for 1979 should permit an assessment of the proportion of those released from Framingham who would be expected to succeed in Charlotte House. Table VI shows the distribution of scores of the two groups on the scale.

TABLE VI

SCALE SCORE	CHARLOTTE HOUSE SUCCESSFUL		CHARLOTTE HOUSE UNSUCCESSFUL		FRAMINGHAM RELEASES	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	0	(0)	2	(11)	0	(0)
2	1	(4)	3	(17)	0	(0)
3	1	(4)	5	(28)	5	(3)
4	1	(4)	3	(17)	21	(13)
5	3	(11)	2	(11)	36	(23)
6	1	(4)	0	(0)	34	(21)
7	5	(19)	2	(11)	27	(17)
8	3	(11)	0	(0)	18	(11)
9	5	(19)	0	(0)	13	(8)
10	1	(4)	0	(0)	6	(4)
11	6	(22)	1	(5)	0	(0)
TOTAL	27	(100)	18	(100)	160	(100)
MEAN	7.8		3.8		6.2	
MEDIAN	8		3		6	

As Table V shows, 79% of the Charlotte House successful completers had a scale score of six and above. Sixteen percent of the Charlotte House unsuccessful completers had a scale score of six and above and 61% of the Framingham releases had a scale score of six and above. Likewise, 8% of the Charlotte House successful completers had a score of 3 or less, 56% of the Charlotte House unsuccessful completers had a score of 3 or less, and 3% of the Framingham releases had this scale score. Based on this multi-variate analysis of the variables that distinguished successful and unsuccessful Charlotte House placements, the Framingham releases have characteristics similar to the Charlotte House successful completer sample.

DISCUSSION

This report examined the women released from MCI-Framingham during 1979. Based on this analysis, several conclusions can be made. First, those women who were released from Framingham for the most part did not have the opportunity to participate in the furlough program or to receive a placement in a pre-release facility even though empty pre-release beds for women have consistently existed. Secondly, the majority of women had never escaped during their incarceration. Thirdly, a majority of these women served more than one month and so were viable candidates for pre-release. Lastly, when an analysis is made of the women released from Framingham based on the variables that were found to distinguish successful Charlotte House pre-release placements, the women released from Framingham in 1979 were just as likely to be successes in Charlotte House as those women released from that facility.

This analysis points up a need to develop a classification process that better enables these eligible women to participate in the graduated release or reintegration programs. While many would argue that women in the system do not serve enough time to justify pre-release placements, the results would seem to indicate that a mechanism can be established to provide the pre-release option to women who serve more than one month at Framingham. Published reports have shown that women released from Charlotte House[5] and pre-release in general have lower recidivism rates than those released from walled institutions. These reports have controlled for selection factors* and consistently have shown statistically significantly lower recidivism rates for the pre-release releases versus non-pre-release releases. This would make obvious the conclusion that making the pre-release option available for these women and utilizing it to the fullest will result in benefits both for the Department and for

*The Charlotte House recidivism report did not control for selection factors due to the small sample size.

the individual women involved. Also equally as important, the society at large would benefit since these women would be returning to the community less likely to commit further crimes.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Smart, Yvette, An Analysis of Recidivism Rates Among Residents Released from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions in 1977, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication Number 182, November, 1979.

[2] Holt, Linda K., An Analysis of Recent Trends in Court Commitments to the Massachusetts Department of Correction, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication Number 207, September, 1980.

[3] Williams, Lawrence T., A Statistical Description of Court Commitments to Massachusetts Correctional Institutions during 1979, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication Number 196, July 1980.

[4] Williams, Lawrence T., A Profile of Characteristics Distinguishing Between Program Completers and Program Non-Completers Charlotte House 1977 and 1978 Releases. Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication Number 202, August, 1980.

[5] Williams, Lawrence T., An Analysis of Recidivism Among Women Released From Charlotte House: 1977 and 1978 Releases, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication Number 203, August, 1980.

[6] Smart, Yvette, An Analysis of Recidivism Rates Among Residents Released from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions in 1977, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication Number 182, November, 1979.

APPENDIX

	NUMBER	PERCENT
1. Court From Which Committed		
Essex	5	(3)
Middlesex	8	(5)
Norfolk	2	(1)
Plymouth	1	(0)
Suffolk	14	(9)
Worcester	12	(8)
Municipal Courts	46	(29)
District Courts	72	(45)
TOTAL	160	(100)
2. Jail Credits		
None	130	(81)
1 to 10	17	(11)
11 to 50	11	(7)
51 to 100	2	(1)
TOTAL	160	(100)
3. Minimum Sentence		
1 Year	1	(1)
5 Years	1	(1)
9 Years	1	(0)
Indeterminate	156	(98)
Day to Day	1	(0)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
4. Maximum Sentence		
Less than one month	41	(26)
Less than one year	62	(39)
1 Year	17	(11)
2 Years	23	(14)
3 Years	1	(1)
5 Years	5	(3)
6 Years	1	(1)
7 Years	1	(1)
8 Years	1	(1)
10 Years	5	(3)
11 to 12 Years	1	(0)
20 or more years	1	(0)
Day to Day	1	(0)
TOTAL	160	(100)
5. Type of Sentence		
One sentence only	102	(64)
Concurrent Sentence	47	(29)
Aggregate Sentence	10	(6)
From & After Sentence	1	(1)
TOTAL	160	(100)
6. Present Offense - General Categories		
Person	29	(18)
Sex	2	(1)
Property	65	(41)
Drug	10	(6)
Other	54	(34)
TOTAL	160	(100)
7. Present Offense - Person		
Not Applicable	131	(82)
Manslaughter	1	(0)
Armed Robbery	4	(3)
Unarmed Robbery	4	(3)
Armed Assault	9	(6)
Unarmed Assault	9	(6)
Kidnapping	1	(0)
Conspiracy	1	(0)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
8. Present Offense - Property		
Not Applicable	95	(59)
Arson	2	(1)
Burglary - Armed	1	(1)
Burglary	7	(4)
Stealing	1	(1)
Larceny - Person	10	(6)
Larceny	29	(18)
Vehicle Theft	3	(2)
Forgery & Uttering	9	(6)
Stolen Goods	3	(2)
TOTAL	160	(100)
9. Present Offense - Sex		
Not Applicable	158	(98)
Rape of Minor	1	(1)
Unnatural Acts	1	(1)
TOTAL	160	(100)
10. Present Offense - Drugs		
Not Applicable	150	(94)
Possession of Narcotics	3	(2)
Controlled Substance - Class A	4	(3)
Controlled Substance - Class B	1	(1)
Controlled Substance - Class C	1	(0)
Controlled Substance - Unclassified	1	(0)
TOTAL	160	(100)
11. Present Offense - Other		
Not Applicable	106	(66)
Escape	2	(1)
Weapons Offenses	1	(1)
Disturbing the Peace	10	(6)
Prostitution	25	(16)
Vehicle Offenses	1	(0)
Contempt of Court	3	(2)
Other	12	(8)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
12. Age at Incarceration		
17	8	(5)
18	13	(8)
19	9	(6)
20	12	(8)
21	5	(3)
22	20	(13)
23	12	(8)
24	10	(6)
25	9	(6)
26 - 29	33	(20)
30 - 39	14	(9)
40 - 64	13	(8)
65 and Older	2	(0)
TOTAL	160	(100)
13. Race		
White	108	(68)
Black	51	(32)
Hispanic	1	(0)
TOTAL	160	(100)
14. Marital Status		
Married	21	(13)
Single	95	(59)
Divorced	15	(9)
Widowed	7	(5)
Separated	15	(9)
Unknown	7	(5)
TOTAL	160	(100)
15. Military Discharge		
No Service	140	(88)
Honorable	2	(1)
Unknown	18	(11)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
16. Prior Address Selected Cities and Towns		
Boston	53	(33)
Brockton	1	(1)
Cambridge	8	(5)
Fall River	1	(0)
Framingham	2	(1)
Holyoke	1	(0)
Lawrence	3	(2)
Lowell	3	(2)
Lynn	7	(4)
Quincy	4	(3)
Somerville	3	(2)
Worcester	35	(22)
Other Massachusetts	35	(22)
Out of State	4	(3)
TOTAL	160	(100)
17. Prior Address - County		
Worcester	39	(24)
Middlesex	29	(18)
Suffolk	56	(35)
Norfolk	8	(5)
Bristol	2	(1)
Plymouth	3	(2)
Essex	15	(9)
Hampshire	1	(1)
Hampden	1	(1)
Berkshire	1	(1)
Barnstable	1	(0)
Out of State	4	(3)
TOTAL	160	(100)
18. Prior Address - SMSA		
Boston	94	(59)
Brockton	2	(1)
Fall River	1	(1)
Fitchburg - Leominster	2	(1)
Lawrence - Haverhill	5	(3)
Lowell	3	(2)
Pittsfield	1	(0)
Springfield	2	(1)
Worcester	35	(22)
Other Massachusetts	11	(7)
Out of State	4	(3)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
19. Occupation		
Professional	3	(2)
Semi-Professional	4	(3)
Business	1	(0)
Sales, Clerical	33	(21)
Manual	26	(16)
Services	48	(30)
Housekeeper	2	(1)
Unemployed	16	(10)
Unknown	27	(17)
TOTAL	160	(100)
20. Time at Most Skilled Position		
Less than one month	25	(16)
1 - 2 Months	20	(13)
3 - 4 Months	12	(8)
5 - 6 Months	12	(8)
7 - 9 Months	7	(2)
10 - 12 Months	9	(6)
1 - 2 Years	18	(11)
2 - 5 Years	11	(7)
More Than 5 Years	10	(6)
Unknown	36	(23)
TOTAL	160	(100)
21. Time on Job of Longest Duration		
Less than one month	25	(16)
1 - 2 Months	15	(9)
3 - 4 Months	12	(8)
5 - 6 Months	14	(9)
7 - 9 Months	7	(4)
10 - 12 Months	9	(6)
1 - 2 Years	21	(13)
2 - 5 Years	12	(8)
More Than 5 Years	10	(6)
Unknown	35	(22)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
22. Last Grade Completed		
Fifth	2	(1)
Sixth	3	(2)
Seventh	6	(4)
Eighth	12	(8)
Ninth	25	(16)
Tenth	21	(13)
Eleventh	29	(18)
Twelfth	36	(23)
G.E.D.	9	(6)
Some College	3	(2)
College Graduate	1	(1)
Unknown	13	(8)
TOTAL	160	(100)
23. Known Drug Use		
No Mention of Drugs	72	(45)
Non-specific	12	(8)
Heroin	49	(31)
Other Specific	18	(11)
Marijuana Only	2	(1)
Unknown	7	(4)
TOTAL	160	(100)
24. Total Number of Court Appearances		
One	43	(27)
Two	8	(5)
Three	5	(3)
Four	13	(8)
Five	3	(2)
Six - Eight	15	(9)
Nine - Eleven	16	(10)
Twelve - Fifteen	22	(14)
Sixteen - Twenty	4	(3)
Over 20	25	(16)
Unknown	6	(4)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
25. Number of Prior Charges for Person Offenses		
None	56	(35)
One	22	(14)
Two	18	(11)
Three	5	(3)
Four	8	(5)
Five	7	(4)
Six to Eight	4	(3)
Over Eight	5	(3)
Unknown	35	(22)
TOTAL	160	(100)
26. Number of Prior Charges for Sex Offenses		
None	119	(74)
One	6	(4)
Two	1	(1)
Unknown	34	(21)
TOTAL	160	(100)
27. Number of Prior Charges for Property Offenses		
None	24	(15)
One	17	(11)
Two	9	(6)
Three	12	(8)
Four	8	(5)
Five	7	(4)
Six to Eight	10	(6)
Over Eight	39	(24)
Unknown	34	(21)
TOTAL	160	(100)
28. Number of Prior Charges for Escape Offenses		
None	110	(69)
One	10	(6)
Two	2	(1)
Three or More	3	(2)
Unknown	35	(22)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
29. Number of Prior Charges for Drunkenness Offenses		
None	103	(64)
One	11	(7)
Two	4	(3)
Three	1	(1)
Four	1	(1)
Five or More	5	(3)
Unknown	35	(22)
TOTAL	160	(100)
30. Number of Prior Charges for Drug Offenses		
None	77	(48)
One	17	(11)
Two	5	(3)
Three	6	(4)
Four	5	(3)
Five or More	17	(11)
Unknown	33	(21)
TOTAL	160	(100)
31. Number of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations		
None	113	(71)
One	10	(6)
Two	2	(1)
Three	1	(1)
Five	1	(1)
Unknown	33	(21)
TOTAL	160	(100)
32. Number of Prior County Incarcerations		
None	106	(66)
One	13	(8)
Three	3	(2)
Four	3	(2)
Five	1	(1)
Six or More	2	(1)
Unknown	32	(20)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
33. Number of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations		
None	95	(59)
One	18	(11)
Two	9	(6)
Three	6	(4)
Four	1	(1)
Five	2	(1)
Six or More	2	(1)
Unknown	27	(17)
TOTAL	160	(100)
34. Number of Prior Adult Incarcerations		
None	81	(51)
One	19	(12)
Two	10	(6)
Three	7	(4)
Four	3	(2)
Five	3	(2)
Six or More	5	(3)
Unknown	32	(20)
TOTAL	160	(100)
35. Number of Any Prior Incarcerations		
None	70	(44)
One	26	(16)
Two	10	(6)
Three	8	(5)
Four	3	(2)
Five	3	(2)
Six or More	7	(4)
Unknown	33	(21)
TOTAL	160	(100)
36. Number of Prior Juvenile Paroles		
None	125	(78)
One	5	(3)
Two	1	(1)
Unknown	29	(18)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
37. Number of Prior Juvenile Parole Violations		
Never Paroled	125	(78)
None	3	(2)
One	3	(2)
Unknown	29	(18)
TOTAL	160	(100)
38. Number of Prior Adult Paroles		
None	103	(64)
One	19	(12)
Two	6	(4)
Three	3	(2)
Four or More	1	(1)
Unknown	28	(18)
TOTAL	160	(100)
39. Total Number of Prior Adult Parole Violations		
Never Paroled	103	(64)
None	10	(6)
One	11	(7)
Two	8	(5)
Unknown	28	(18)
TOTAL	160	(100)
40. Total Number of Prior Paroles		
None	98	(61)
One	21	(13)
Two	6	(4)
Three	4	(3)
Four or More	1	(1)
Unknown	30	(19)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
41. Total Number of Prior Parole Violations		
Never Paroled	98	(61)
None	13	(8)
One	10	(6)
Two	9	(6)
Unknown	30	(19)
TOTAL	160	(100)
42. Age at First Arrest		
12 or Younger	5	(3)
13	10	(6)
14	12	(8)
15	6	(4)
16	8	(5)
17	16	(10)
18	20	(13)
19	8	(5)
20	5	(3)
21	4	(3)
22	1	(1)
23	2	(1)
24	5	(3)
26 - 29	3	(2)
30 - 39	5	(3)
Over 40	6	(4)
Unknown	44	(29)
TOTAL	160	(100)
43. Age at First Drunk Arrest		
Not Applicable	101	(63)
14 or Younger	2	(1)
15 - 17	4	(3)
18 - 19	3	(2)
20 - 21	1	(1)
22 - 25	4	(3)
26 - 29	1	(1)
30 - 39	4	(3)
40 and Older	1	(1)
Unknown	39	(24)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
44. Age at First Drug Arrest		
Not Applicable	76	(48)
14 or Younger	3	(2)
15 - 17	9	(6)
18 - 19	9	(6)
20 - 21	10	(6)
22 - 25	10	(6)
26 - 29	3	(2)
30 - 39	1	(1)
Unknown	39	(24)
TOTAL	160	(100)
45. Total Number of Furloughs		
None	134	(84)
One	4	(3)
2 to 5	13	(8)
6 to 10	2	(1)
11 to 15	4	(3)
16 to 20	2	(1)
21 to 30	1	(1)
TOTAL	160	(100)
46. Number of Successful Furlough Outcomes		
Never Furloughed	134	(84)
One	4	(3)
Two to Five	14	(9)
6 to 10	3	(2)
11 to 15	3	(2)
16 to 20	2	(1)
TOTAL	160	(100)
47. Number of Late Under Furlough Outcomes		
Never Furloughed	134	(84)
None	16	(10)
One	5	(3)
2 to 5	5	(3)
TOTAL	160	(100)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
48. Number of Late Over Furlough Outcomes		
Never Furloughed	134	(84)
None	26	(16)
TOTAL	160	(100)
49. Number of Escape Furlough Outcomes		
Never Furloughed	134	(84)
None	25	(16)
One	1	(1)
TOTAL	160	(100)
50. Type of Release		
Parole	68	(43)
Discharge	19	(12)
Expiration	73	(46)
TOTAL	160	(100)
51. Age at Release		
17 or Younger	4	(3)
18	13	(8)
19	10	(6)
20	7	(4)
21	7	(4)
22	14	(9)
23	17	(11)
24	8	(5)
25	5	(3)
26 - 29	39	(24)
30 - 39	21	(13)
40 and Older	15	(9)
TOTAL	160	(100)

REFERENCES

1. Holt, Linda K., An Analysis of Recent Trends in Court Commitments to the Massachusetts Department of Correction, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 207, September, 1980.

2. Smart, Yvette, An Analysis of Recidivism Rates Among Residents Released From Massachusetts Correctional Institutions in 1977. Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 182, November, 1979.

3. Williams, Lawrence T., Client Profile - Charlotte House - 1977 and 1978 Releases, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 201, August, 1980.

4. Williams, Lawrence T., A Profile of Characteristics Distinguishing Between Program Completers and Program Non-Completers - Charlotte House: 1977 and 1978 Releases, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 202, August, 1980.

5. Williams, Lawrence T., An Analysis of Recidivism Among Women Released From Charlotte House: 1977 and 1978 Releases, Massachusetts Department of Correction Publication No. 203, August, 1980.